

REMARKS

Further and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks.

Claim Amendments

Claims 4, 8 and 14 have been amended to replace the formula of an asparagine derivative with the formula of an aspartic acid derivative. Support for these amendments is found in the specification. Specifically, as noted by the Examiner, page 13 of the specification teaches the use of a compound which is Aloc-Asp-OBu¹ to afford an asparagine-linked trisaccharide. As also noted by the Examiner, the abbreviation Asp denotes aspartic acid, not asparagine. Thus, the above-mentioned claim amendments are clearly supported by the specification, and no new matter has been added to the application by these amendments.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

Claims 4, 8 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement. This rejection is rendered moot by the above-discussed claim amendments.

Specifically, the Examiner indicates that claims 4, 8 and 14 were (previously) amended to incorporate a chemical structure which was not described in the specification. The Examiner further indicated that page 13 of the specification teaches the use of a compound which is Aloc-Asp-OBu¹ to afford an asparagine-linked trisaccharide, but that is a different compound than the formula which was (previously) incorporated into claims 4 and 8. The Examiner states that the abbreviation Asp denotes aspartic acid, not asparagine.

As discussed above, Applicants have amended the claims to include the formula of protected aspartic acid, rather than protected asparagine.

Furthermore, as indicated by the reference W. Günther et al., "Synthesis of a β -Mannosyl-Chitobiosyl-Asparagine Conjugate - A Central Core Region Unit of the *N*-Glycoproteins" (filed with the IDS dated September 13, 2006), a formation of an amide derivative by the reaction of

-N=C=O moiety with an aspartic acid derivative was already known when the present application was filed. Thus, the amended portion of Applicants' claims is clearly described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the above-rejection be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

The rejection of claims 4, 8 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite has been rendered moot by the above-discussed claim amendments.

Claim Allowance

Applicants acknowledge, with thanks, the Examiner's indication of the allowance of claims 3, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 13. In view of the above-discussed amendments and comments, it is respectfully asserted that each of Applicants' pending claims is now in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

Therefore, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is submitted that each of the grounds of rejection set forth by the Examiner has been overcome, and that the application is in condition for allowance. Such allowance is solicited.

If, after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner feels there are any issues remaining which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Shinichiro NISHIMURA et al.

/Amy E. Schmid/
By: 2009.06.11 16:55:40 -04'00'
Amy E. Schmid
Registration No. 55,965
Attorney for Applicants

AES/emj
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
June 11, 2009